



## PAPACY, CATHOLICOSATE, AND THE KINGDOM OF CILICIAN ARMENIA

*Peter Halfter*

During the Crusades, the Armenians in Cilicia tried to establish good relations with the Roman Church. Armenian Christianity, then hardly known in the European West, and the powerful Roman Church came into contact on two levels. The first level was the local one: soon after the First Crusade the papal legate Daibert of Pisa founded Latin bishoprics in the cities of Tarsus and Mamistra, and Armenian and Latin monasteries became neighbors in the Black Mountains near Antioch.<sup>1</sup> Although it would be very interesting to examine the local contacts between the Armenian and the Latin clergy, the subject of this survey focuses on Papal-Armenian relations during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For background material and useful analyses, see François Tournèize, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie depuis les origines des Arméniens jusqu'à la mort de leur dernier roi (l'an 1393)* (Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard: [1910]); Bernard Hamilton, "The Armenian Church and the Papacy at the Time of Crusades," *Eastern Church Review* 10 (1978): 61-87; Charles A. Frazee, "The Christian Church in Cilician Armenia: Its Relations with Rome and Constantinople to 1198," *Church History* 45 (1976): 166-84; Peter Halfter, *Das Papsttum und die Armenier im frühen und hohen Mittelalter: Von den ersten Kontakten bis zur Fixierung der Kirchenunion im Jahre 1198* (Cologne, Weimar, Vienna: Böhlau, 1996); Anne-Dorothee von den Brincken, *Die Nationes Christianorum Orientalium im Verständnis der lateinischen Historiographie von der Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts bis in die zweite Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1973), pp. 181-210; Michael Matzke, *Daibert von Pisa, zwischen Pisa, Papst und erstem Kreuzzug* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1998), p. 161; Azat Bozoyan, "La culture de l'âge d'argent' et Rome (fin XI<sup>e</sup>-début XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle)," in *Roma - Armenia*, ed. Claude Mutafian (Rome: Edizioni De Luca, 1999), pp. 131-36.

<sup>2</sup> Nerses of Lambron (Lampron) was impressed by the charitable institutions, the activity of church-building, and the ecclesiastical discipline of the Latin Church. On

There had been contacts between the Latin and Armenian churches in earlier times. During the Photian schism, prompted by the controversial election of Photius as Patriarch of Constantinople in 858 and the ensuing Latin-Byzantine confrontation, Pope Nicholas I had tried to send a letter on dogmatic matters to Prince Ashot, the founder of the Bagratuni (Bagratid) kingdom. It is not certain that the letter reached Ashot, for the papal legate was not allowed to enter and pass through Byzantine territory. From the Latin copy of the letter, which is kept in the Monte Cassino library,<sup>3</sup> it becomes apparent that Prince Ashot had himself previously written to the pope, professing his orthodoxy.<sup>4</sup>

In 1080, Pope Gregory VII welcomed a nuncio of Catholicos Gregory (Grigor) II. The catholicos wanted the pope to take action against a certain Maccharus (Magar), who had been accused by the Armenian Church of being a heretic and who had sought refuge in southern Italy.<sup>5</sup> The pope granted the request, but he also seized this opportunity to write a letter to the catholicos asking him about some liturgical peculiarities he had heard about.<sup>6</sup>

But these attempts remained isolated and had no significant consequences. The situation changed with the foundation of Crusader states in the Near East, making the Armenians in Cilicia and the Franks immediate neighbors. The mutual interests between the two churches now became so strong that it was mandatory to strengthen relations, especially because the popes presumed, like some Western historiographers (William of Tyros and Otto of Freising), that Armenian Christianity had a very large follow-

---

the reforms he introduced in his diocese inspired by the Latin customs, see Hamilton, "Armenian Church," pp. 72-73; Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 157-63.

<sup>3</sup> Photocopy appears in Mutaſian, *Roma - Armenia*, pp. 120-21; for the papal letter, see "Nicolai I. Papae Epistolae," in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae VI*, ed. Ernst Perels (Beroloniae: apud Weidmannos, 1925), doc. 87, pp. 451-54.

<sup>4</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 85-110; Poghos [Boghos] Ananian, "Ashot Ishkhanin havakan tghtaksutiune Nikoghos A[rajin] papin het" [The Probable Correspondence of Prince Ashot with Pope Nicholas I], *Bazmaveb* 149 (1991): 332-45.

<sup>5</sup> In the early Middle Ages there were Armenian communities in southern Italy, especially in the old Byzantine territories of Calabria and Apulia. See Maria M. de Martiis, "Dans le sillage des itinéraires arméniens en Italie méridionale (X<sup>e</sup> -XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle)," in Mutaſian, *Roma - Armenia*, pp. 202-04.

<sup>6</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 114-21.

ing.<sup>7</sup> In the eyes of the Holy See a union with the Armenian Church would enlarge the flock of Saint Peter considerably. As this discussion deals with religious dialogue in Cilician Armenia, the first question to be asked is: Were the connections between the two churches strong enough to lay the foundation for a meaningful dialogue?

In seeking an answer, two basic difficulties arise. There is the problem of historical sources, as valid information comes only from one side because almost all letters written to the popes by the catholicoses in the twelfth century are now lost.<sup>8</sup> Only the written replies of the popes have survived. It is from these replies by Pope Innocent II,<sup>9</sup> Lucius III,<sup>10</sup> and Clement III<sup>11</sup> sent to Cilicia that the gist of what the Armenian Church leaders had written to Rome becomes apparent.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, the special view that the Roman Church had of itself and its role in Western Christendom must be taken into account. Since the eleventh century, all popes claimed a clear leadership role over all other churches. As a result any church not willing to accept the primacy of the Roman See was simply and clearly classified as schismatic.<sup>13</sup> This attitude did not support a dialogue in the way the term is used today. Generally the papal letters to the Armenians were written in a rather cordial manner; however, they did not allow the slightest doubt about the right of the Roman Church to give the Armenians specific directives in religious

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., pp. 143, 152.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., pp. 132, 150, 175.

<sup>9</sup> *Ararat* 26 (1893): 133-38.

<sup>10</sup> Alexander Balguy, *Historiae doctrinae catholicae inter Armenos unionisque eorum cum ecclesia Romana in Concilio Fiorentino* (Vienna: Mekhitarist Press, 1878), pp. 54-56.

<sup>11</sup> *Ararat* 26 (1893): 140-44. For the German translation of Clement's reply, see Siegfried Löwenfeld, "Drei Briefe Clemens III.: Aus dem Armenischen übersetzt durch Dr. Karamazianz," *Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 14 (1898): 178-82; for the French translation, see Léonce [Ghevond] M. Alishan, *Léon le Magnifique, premier roi de Sissouan, ou de l'Arménocilie* (Venice: Mekhitarist Press, 1888), pp. 163-65; for the Italian translation, see Piero Zerbi, *Papato, Impero e "Repubblica Christiana" dal 1187 al 1198* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1955), pp. 30-31.

<sup>12</sup> A new edition of these papal letters by Poghos Ananian appears in *Bazmaveh* 154 (1996): 201-36.

<sup>13</sup> Hamilton, "Armenian Church," pp. 71-72.

matters.<sup>14</sup> On the one hand, Innocent II and Lucius III admired the Armenian Christians for having preserved their Christianity in a hostile Islamic environment,<sup>15</sup> while, on the other hand, they were not willing to tolerate indigenous Armenian traditions which were different from those of the Roman Church. Therefore, the term dialogue as now understood, namely a discourse of equal partners, may only be used for the exchanges Nerses Shnorhali had with the Greeks.<sup>16</sup> But for the contacts between the Roman Church and the Armenians, the term should only be applied with cautious reservation.

As for Roman-Armenian relations during the twelfth century, contacts between the two sides were limited until 1184 to the heads of the respective churches and were not confined only to religious problems as such. It is important to recall the political power of Byzantium, which was looked upon with suspicion by the Franks as well as by the Armenians. Before the defeat at Myriokephalon in 1176 at the hands of Seljuk Sultan Kilij Arslan, the Byzantine Empire was extremely powerful.<sup>17</sup> Emperors John

<sup>14</sup> For the letter of Pope Innocent II to the Catholicos Gregory III, for example, see Andrea B. Schmidt and Peter Halfter, "Der Brief Papst Innozenz' II. an den armenischen Katholikos Gregor III.: Ein wenig beachtetes Dokument zur Geschichte des Konzils von Jerusalem (Ostern 1141)," *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 31 (1999): 50-71, esp. pp. 61, 67.

<sup>15</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, p. 152.

<sup>16</sup> On the literature about the Greek-Armenian dialogue, see Pascal Tekeyan, *Controverses christologiques en Arméno-Cilicie dans la seconde moitié du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle (1165-1198)* (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1939; repr., 1966); Ernst Suttner, "Eine 'ökumenische' Bewegung im 12. Jahrhundert und ihr bedeutendster Theologe, der armenische Katholikos Nersès Schnorhali," *Kleronomia* 7 (1975): 87-97; Hrant Khatchadourian, "The Christology of St. Nerses Shnorhali in Dialogue with Byzantium," *Miscellanea Franceseana* 78 (1978): 413-34; Boghos L. Zekian, "Un dialogue oecuménique au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Actes du XV<sup>e</sup> Congrès international d'Etudes Byzantines, Athènes, Septembre 1976* (Athens: Athinaí Archaïologíi etaireía, 1980), pp. 420-41; idem, "St. Nersès en dialogue avec les Grecs: Un prophète de l'oecuménisme au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle," in *Armenian Studies/ Etudes Arméniennes: In Memoriam Haïg Berbérian*, ed. Dickran Kouymjian (Lisbon: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 1986), pp. 861-83; Boghos L. Zekian, "Aux sommets de la théologie chrétienne: La synthèse oecuménique en Cilicie arménienne," in Mutafian, *Roma - Armenia*, pp. 122-25; Aram Keshishian, "The Problem of Church Unity in the Twelfth Century: The Correspondence of Nerses Shnorhali with Manuel Comnenos (1165-1173)," *Hask* 1 (1980): 91-106.

<sup>17</sup> Georg Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (Munich: Beck, 1963), p. 328; Winfried Hecht, "Das Komnenenreich auf dem Gipfel seiner Macht,"

II and Manuel Comnenus (Komnenos) conquered Cilician Armenia twice<sup>18</sup> and became a major threat to the Frankish principality of Antioch.<sup>19</sup> This mutual threat had drawn Franks and Armenians together. Furthermore, Catholicos Gregory (Grigor) III, who lived on the territory of the Frankish County of Edessa, planned to protect the believers and the possessions of the Armenian Church in Cilicia by seeking help from the Holy See in Rome.<sup>20</sup> In 1141 and 1144, he sent protestations of faith or *confessiones fidei* to the pope.<sup>21</sup> Gregory III hoped that the pope's arbitration would cancel the old Byzantine accusation that the Armenians were monophysitic heretics.<sup>22</sup> In 1184, Gregory IV wrote the same kind of letters, but for another reason. The Armenian minority living in the Byzantine Empire was being persecuted, and the catholicos appealed to the pope to use his diplomatic influence to protect this Christian people.<sup>23</sup> The replies of Innocent II and Lucius III have been preserved in Armenian translations.<sup>24</sup> In both letters, the popes reacted positively and characterized the Armenians as true believers. The Armenian historiographers contentedly noted the successful initiatives of the catholicoses. However, what the

---

in Franz G. Maier, *Byzanz* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1973), p. 266.

<sup>18</sup> Sirapie Der Nersessian, "The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia," in *A History of the Crusades*, ed. Kenneth M. Setton (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962), vol. 2, p. 637; Claude Mutafian, *La Cilicie au carrefour des empires*, 2 vols. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1988), vol. 1, p. 375; Arshak Ter-Mikelian, *Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zur byzantinischen (vom IV. bis zum XIII. Jahrhundert)* (Leipzig: Gustav Fock, 1892), p. 86.

<sup>19</sup> Bernard Hamilton, "Ralph of Domfront, Patriarch of Antioch (1135-1140)," *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 28 (1984): 10; Rudolf Hiestand, "Ein neuer Bericht über das Konzil von Antiochia," *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 19 (1987): 337.

<sup>20</sup> Hamilton, "Armenian Church," pp. 65-66.

<sup>21</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 126-43; Schmidt and Halfter, "Brief Papst Innozenz' II.," pp. 50-71.

<sup>22</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 129-31.

<sup>23</sup> Wilfried Hecht, "Byzanz und die Armenier nach dem Tode Kaiser Manuels I. (1180-1196)," *Byzantion* 37 (1968): 66-74.

<sup>24</sup> There are five papal letters that are preserved only in Armenian translations. It is generally presumed that it was Nerses of Lambron who translated the letters from Latin into the Armenian language. The thirteenth- and fourteenth-century translations can be found in Matenaderan MS 1026; the letter of Innocent II, folio 221verso, Lucius III to Catholicos Gregory IV, folio 170v-177v, the two letters of Clement III to the Catholicos Gregory IV, folio 213recto-217verso, 217verso-218recto. The letter of Pope Innocent II is reproduced in Mutafian, *Roma - Armenia*, p. 126.

Armenian historians concealed was the fact that both popes demanded from the Armenians the adoption of certain Latin customs, especially those concerning the right date for observing Christmas and the correct way of celebrating the Eucharist.<sup>25</sup> But it was exactly these Armenian peculiarities that the Armenians regarded as sacrosanct and consequently not subject to change. Their abolition would mean a total betrayal of the Armenian religious identity.<sup>26</sup> The popes were not properly conscious of this very special problem. Their knowledge of Armenian history, traditions, and religious practices was quite limited.<sup>27</sup> The problem was aggravated by the fact that the Armenian missions to Rome gave rise to a fundamental misinterpretation that made the requests of the catholicoses to the Holy See seem like a readiness of the Armenian Church to subordinate itself to Rome.<sup>28</sup>

Regarding Armenian attitudes toward the Roman Church and the Papacy, there can be no doubt that long before the twelfth century the popes were viewed as the true successors of Saint Peter.<sup>29</sup> The reputation of the popes can be clearly seen in the veneration of Saint Silvester within the Armenian Church. Already in the seventh century, the story of the miracles he had performed were translated from Greek to Armenian.<sup>30</sup> Even earlier, Silvester's name appeared in connection with the reputed journey of Saint Gregory the Illuminator (Grigor Lusavorich) to Rome.<sup>31</sup> During the twelfth century the apocryphal pact between

<sup>25</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 132-35, 138, 151-53, 155, 164-65. Schmidt and Halfter, "Brief Papst Innozenz' II.," pp. 59-60.

<sup>26</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 178-81.

<sup>27</sup> Innocent II admitted freely that his knowledge about the Armenian Church was modest. He requested Catholicos Gregory II to send him his brother Nerses, known to be a great theologian, to instruct him on the Armenian and the other Oriental churches. See Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 361-62; Schmidt and Halfter, "Brief Papst Innozenz' II.," p. 61.

<sup>28</sup> Schmidt and Halfter, "Brief Papst Innozenz' II.," p. 57.

<sup>29</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 68-70.

<sup>30</sup> Paul Peeters, "La version arménienne de l'historien Socrate," in Paul Peeters, *Recherches d'histoire et de philologie orientales* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1951), vol. 1, pp. 313, 335.

<sup>31</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 71-78, Robert W. Thomson, "Constantine and Trdat in Armenian Tradition," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 50 (1997): 277-89; idem, "The Crusaders through Armenian Eyes," in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, ed. Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy P. Mottahedeh (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 2001), pp. 71-82; Marie E.

Silvester and Gregory was fabricated. This was a letter asserting that Gregory had received his ordination by Pope Silvester who made him his representative in the eastern parts of Christendom.<sup>32</sup> Whoever may have made up this document, it in fact reflects the wishes and hope the Armenians placed in the Roman Church. They had a pact of friendship between equal partners in their minds and were ready to concede a position of honor to the pope. Their respect for his office, however, did not include the idea that he should have the right to give orders to other churches.<sup>33</sup>

The crisis of the Crusader states after the Christian defeat at the battle of Hattin in 1187 influenced Roman-Armenian relations considerably.<sup>34</sup> Only a few Crusader strongholds withstood the armies of Saladin.<sup>35</sup> At the same time, Cilician Armenia developed into a powerful state.<sup>36</sup> On May 29, 1189, Pope Clement III wrote to the Armenian spiritual and secular heads in Cilicia to ask them to support and even join the Crusader campaign to recapture the Holy Land.<sup>37</sup> This was the first time that the papal letters were directed not only to the catholicos but also to Leo (Levon), the new prince of Cilicia, "Léon de Montanis." Leo's dynasty, the Rubenian or Rubenid, had become the strongest among the local lords of Cilicia. The aim of the Franks to defend the Crusader states together with Cilicia went hand in hand with Leo's ambitions, namely to turn his principality into a kingdom. In the Middle Ages it was commonly held that only an emperor or the pope could coronate a king. Leo wanted to have his crown from the Western emperor and not from Byzantium,

---

Shirinian, "'The Letter of Love and Concord' between Rome and Armenia: A Case of Forgery from the Crusader Period," in *East and West in the Crusader State: Context-Contacts-Confrontations*, ed. Krijnie Ciggaar and Herman Teule, vol. 3 (Louvain and Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2003), pp. 79-99.

<sup>32</sup> The Latin translation is in Johannes D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio*, vol. 2 (Repr. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1960), cols. 461-64.

<sup>33</sup> Hamilton, "Armenian Church," pp. 66, 69.

<sup>34</sup> On the situation of the Crusader states before Hattin, see Horst E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart, Berlin, Cologne: W. Kohlhammer Urbantashenbücher, 1989), pp. 114-22.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 124-25.

<sup>36</sup> Der Nersessian, "The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia," pp. 644-45.

<sup>37</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 172-77.

since the latter had tried to subordinate Cilicia and make it a province. Consequently, before 1189, Leo turned to Emperor Frederick I, who gave a positive response. But everything fell through because of the emperor's sudden death.<sup>38</sup> So, Leo started negotiations with Frederick's son, Henry VI, in 1194.<sup>39</sup> Henry agreed to keep the promise his father had made to Leo. He also intended to start a Crusade and was therefore willing to accept Cilicia as a client kingdom, which met the expectations of both.<sup>40</sup> Some time later Leo tried to involve Pope Celestine III in his coronation as well.<sup>41</sup> Both powers, the "imperium" and the "sacerdotium," should secure his position among the Christian states in the Levant. With these forces as protectors, he could consolidate and extend his realm.

Relatively recent studies on Armenian history assert that Leo made Celestine III the proposal to unite the Armenian Church with the Roman Church in return for the pope's assistance to make him king.<sup>42</sup> This is not correct, as there is no such evidence in the source materials. There are indications, on the other hand, that the Cilician bishops were bewildered and consequently refused to sign the Pact of Union when the papal legate, Konrad of Wittelsbach, presented the demands and insisted that the union

<sup>38</sup> Hans Hirsch, "Das Recht der Königserhebung durch Kaiser und Papst im hohen Mittelalter," in *Festschrift, Ernst Heymann*, vol. 1 (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau, 1940), pp. 209-49; Rudolf Hiestand, "'Precipua tocius christianismi columpna' Barbarossa und der Kreuzzug," in *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, ed. Alfred Haverkamp (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1992), pp. 51-108.

<sup>39</sup> Johann F. Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii IV. Ältere Staufer*, Abt. 3: *Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter Heinrich VI. 1165 (1190)-1197*, new ed. Gerhard Baaken (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1972), doc. 351a, p. 143; Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 193-204.

<sup>40</sup> On the vassalage between Cilicia and the Western Imperium, see Peter Halfter, "Die Staufer und Armenien," in *Von Schwaben nach Jerusalem: Facetten staufischer Geschichte*, ed. Söhnke Lorenz and Ulrich Schmidt (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1995), pp. 187-208; Sigrid Hauser, *Staufische Lehnspolitik am Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts 1180-1197* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1998), pp. 214-19, 265-70.

<sup>41</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 190-93.

<sup>42</sup> Theodor Rohde, *König Leon II. von Kleinarmenien* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1869), p. 39; Alishan, *Léon le Magnifique*, p. 160; Tournebize, *Histoire de l'Arménie*, p. 268; Claude Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche* (Paris: Geuthner, 1940), p. 268; Paul Z. Bedoukian, *The Coinage of Cilician Armenia* (New York: American Numismatic Society, 1962), p. 9.



should be proclaimed prior to the coronation. These demands were more or less the same that Innocent II and Lucius III had previously presented. Naturally, the Armenians were greatly surprised by these demands because they thought that there were no more disagreements after the popes had attested that the Armenians were true believers in the eyes of Rome.<sup>43</sup> The provisions to reform certain traditions had always been regarded as non-obligatory recommendations. Now the Armenians realized that the Papacy considered its position within the universal Church not as one of special honor but that it wanted to have undisputed leadership vis-à-vis all other churches. As Leo did not want to risk his coronation, he persuaded the catholicos and the bishops to sign the Pact of Union in spite of their misgivings. Having affixed his signature, Catholicos Gregory VI handed the legate a letter for the pope in which he assured the Roman Church of his loyalty: "*et libenter volumus legem et fraternitatum sublimis ecclesie Romane, que est mater omnium ecclesiarum; et nos solebamus eam habere et modo eam habemus et libenter volumus esse ad vestrum mandatum*"; in loose translation: "we want the law and the fraternity of the sublime Roman Church which is the mother of all churches, and we are and have been in communion with her and want to follow her dictates willingly."<sup>44</sup>

A few years after the union had been confirmed, Pope Innocent III defined its terms more precisely. The Armenian Church was to be directly subject to the Holy See and no one else was to interfere in Armenian Church matters.<sup>45</sup> The catholicos was to send a proxy to the "ad limina"—visits every five years,<sup>46</sup> and his presence was also required at the general councils summoned by the pope. In the Levant, the catholicos was to take part in the

---

<sup>43</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 190-93, 221-32.

<sup>44</sup> The original letter in Armenian is lost, but the Latin translation is preserved in the register of Pope Innocent III, *Die Register Innocent' III. 2: Pontifikatsjahr 1198/1199*, ed. Othmar Hageneder, Werner Maleczek, Alfred Strnad (Graz: Böhlau, 1979), doc. 208 (217), pp. 404-06.

<sup>45</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 228-29.

<sup>46</sup> The "Visitatio liminum" was the obligation for every archbishop to visit the sepulchres of St. Peter and St. Paul in the Holy City and to confirm his loyalty to the pope. See H. Straub, "Visitatio liminum," in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2d ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), vol. 10, p. 812.

synods of the Latin Church, which were not to convene without him or his proxy.<sup>47</sup>

As for temporal power, the active participation of the papal legate in the Leo's coronation in Sis meant for the new king the protection of the Holy See, a type of relationship that also existed between the kingdom of Hungary and Rome.<sup>48</sup> What kind of protection could the pope give to the kingdom of Cilicia? Besides launching a Crusade, he could ask the neighboring Frankish states and the powerful military orders to help the Cilian ruler. And Leo made strong demands in regard to support from the pope. In order to enforce the claim of his grand-nephew, Raymond-Ruben, to the principality of Antioch and thereby enhance his own influence, he repeatedly turned to Innocent III between 1199 and 1216.<sup>49</sup> The pope, it was hoped, would make a favorable final decision in this struggle about succession. Here Leo expected too much from the Holy Father, as he wanted the pope to take sides whereas Innocent tried to mediate between the opposing sides. Leo felt that Innocent did not support him sufficiently and considered dissolving the Union with Rome and approaching the Greek Church. Only when the pope excommunicated him in 1211 and threatened to cut off all military aid for his kingdom did Leo rapidly make his peace with his papal

<sup>47</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 228-29.

<sup>48</sup> On papal protection of secular powers, see Johannes Fried, *Der päpstliche Schutz für Laienfürsten: Die politische Geschichte des päpstlichen Schutzprivilegs für Laien (11.-13. Jahrhundert)* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1980). On the similarity between Cilicia and Hungary vis-à-vis the Holy See, see Hirsch, "Das Recht der Königserhebung," pp. 211-12.

<sup>49</sup> On the Antioch war of succession, see Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord*, pp. 598-623; Theodosius T. Haluščynskyj, "Armeniae Parvae Regnum," in *Acta Innocentii Papae III*, ed. Th. Haluščynskyj (Vatican: Pontificia Commissio ad Redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis. Fontes Series III, 1943), vol. 2, pp. 37-44; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem and Cyprus c. 1050-1310: A History of the Hospital of St. John in Jerusalem* (London: Macmillan, and New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967), vol. 1, pp. 152-60; M. Nickerson-Hardwicke, "The Crusader States, 1192-1243," in *A History of the Crusades*, ed. Kenneth M. Setton, 2d ed. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), vol. 2, pp. 532-36. See Werner Maleczek, *Petrus Capuanus. Kardinal, Legat am 4. Kreuzzug, Theologe (gest. 1214)* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1988), pp. 160-71, for the details of the time between 1201 and 1204, and pp. 302-05 for the letter of King Leo to Pope Innocent III in which the king complained about the papal legate Petrus Capuanus because the nuncio did not support him sufficiently.

protector.<sup>50</sup>

But every coin has two sides: papal protection also meant a say in the internal affairs of the Cilician kingdom. Between 1210 and 1220 Innocent III and Honorius III were asked several times to back one or another contender to the throne.<sup>51</sup> In 1210, Leo sent ambassadors to Italy asking Emperor Otto IV and Pope Innocent III for permission to crown his grand-nephew and intended successor Raymond-Ruben as *rex iunior*.<sup>52</sup> Five years later it seemed as if Leo would achieve his goal: Raymond-Ruben succeeded in occupying the principality of Antioch. A powerful Armenian-Latin state was on the verge of being established in northwestern Syria, a constellation that met the full approval of Pope Honorius III. In an emphatic letter to Leo, he praised the Cilician king for having valiantly fought for the rights of his grand-nephew and also making him heir of the Cilician throne. The pope encouraged and enjoined Leo to help and to guide Raymond-Ruben in the future.<sup>53</sup> Possibly the urgent exhortation

---

<sup>50</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, p. 282.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 282-93.

<sup>52</sup> Peter Halfter, "Die Beschreibung des armenischen Königreiches Kilikien durch den Hildesheimer Domherren Wilbrand von Oldenburg," in *Armenia and Christian Orient* (Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 2000), pp. 402-21; *idem*, "Eine Beschreibung Kilikiens aus westlicher Sicht: Das Itinerarium des Wilbrand von Oldenburg," *Oriens Christianus* 85 (2001): 176-203.

<sup>53</sup> See, for example, the unpublished letter of the pope, which is preserved in the register of Honorius. See Pietro Pressutti, ed., *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, vol. 1 (Roma, 1888), N° 677, p. 118. The administration of the Archivio Segreto Vaticano kindly sent me a photocopy of the letter: "*Illustri regi armenie. Gratum gerimus et acceptum serenitatem regiam dignis in domino laudibus commentantes quod sicut dilecto filio nobili viro Raimundo Rupini nepote tuo principe antiocheno accepimus intimante tu tamquam princeps catholicus et fidelis ius recognoscens ipsius qui sub tua fuit specialiter tutela relictus disposuisti eidem tamquam vero heredi regni armenie assignare coronam quod effectui mancipasses annis pluribus iam elapsis nisi propositum tuum fuisset per inimicos eiusdem principis retardatum ac ei etiam ad acquirendum et retinendum alia iura sua astitisti hactenus et assistitis adhuc viriliter et potenter propter quod regalis nominis celsitudo sibi apud homines immensos laudum titulos et apud deum gratiam comperavit pietatem in nepote et in rege iustitiam conservando. Verum quoniam non qui ceperit sed qui perseveraverit usque in finem a domino commendatur excellentiam tuam rogamus, mo(nemus) et exhor(tamus) attente quo ob reverentiam apostolice sedis et nostram memoratum principem taliter habeas commendatum, quod idem precum nostrarum obtentu apud te se crevisse cognoscat in gratiam pleniorum et nos magnificentiam regiam possimus ex hoc merito commendare. Datum Ferrariae VIII. kal. Augustae pontificatus nostri*

indicates that there was some tension between Leo and Raymond-Ruben, who had the unique talent of antagonizing everyone. He was expelled from Antioch in 1219 and because of his quarrels with Leo was excluded from the right to succession in the Cilician kingdom in favor of Leo's younger daughter, Zabel.<sup>54</sup> In consolidating Zabel's position as legitimate heiress, Leo arranged a marriage contract with the Hungarian king Andrew II by which little Zabel would be betrothed to Andrew's third son. As her husband he would become king of Cilicia and should govern in her name. Leo made his barons take an oath upon this, and, in addition, he and the Hungarian king applied to Pope Honorius for confirmation of the arrangement.<sup>55</sup> As the contract failed, other pretenders claimed the throne of Cilicia, all hoping to realize their ambitions by papal assistance. Pope Honorius III tried to ameliorate the impending crisis by issuing a number of decrees. One of the pretenders was King John of Brienne of Jerusalem, who claimed the throne of Cilicia in the name of his wife, Leo's elder daughter. The pope threatened excommunication, when he was informed that John was preparing a military expedition to Cilicia in order to win the crown.<sup>56</sup> In the end, Honorius ordered his legate Pelagius to anoint and crown Raymond-Ruben king of Cilicia.<sup>57</sup> The pope must have thought that he had the authority to present the Armenians a king supported by the Holy See. But at the time Raymond-Ruben was already imprisoned after having lost a battle against the Hetumid Constantine of Lambron, and

---

*anno secundo*" [July 25, 1217]. Loose translation of the Latin original text omitting redundant elements of style is as follows: "To the illustrious King of Armenia . . . praising the Lord, we have heard from our beloved son, the noble Raymond-Ruben, your nephew and Prince of Antioch, that you as a catholic and true monarch—recognizing his rights and taking him under your wings—have made him heir of your kingdom. You would have done this many years ago, had not the enemies of this prince prevented your plan. We also heard that you have supported him in gaining and maintaining his other rights up to now. We are asking you to keep up your support until he is king, thus showing your respect to the Apostolic See and our person."

<sup>54</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, p. 285.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 286.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 289-91. For the text of the papal letter, see Otto Hassler, *Pelagius Calvani, Kardinalbischof von Albano: Ein Heerführer der Kurie am Anfang des XIII. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Ebering, 1902), doc. 3, appendix, p. 107.

Honorius was unsuccessful in attempts to arrange for the release of Raymond-Ruben, who died in prison.

Up to the coronation of Hetum I after his marriage to Zabel in 1226, the relations between the Holy See and Cilicia were rather tense. Unlike the Rubenids, the pro-Byzantine Hetumids (Hetumians) did not think fondly of the Franks and the Roman Church; however, when the Hetumids gained the Cilician throne, they did try to improve their relations with both. The *Chronicle* of the Constable Smpad (Smpad) records that in the year of Hetum's coronation the good relations of the kingdom with the Western (Holy Roman) emperor, the sultan of Iconium (Konia), and the pope were renewed.<sup>58</sup> This was probably influenced by the fact that the West under Emperor Frederick II was preparing to launch a new Crusade.<sup>59</sup> For the rest of the thirteenth century, however, relations with the Papacy were not as strong as they had been under King Leo.

With their endorsement of the Pact of Union, the catholicos and the bishops had assumed an onerous obligation. Rome demanded reforms in liturgical matters that the Armenians regarded as sacrosanct. In 1203, Cardinal Petrus Capuanus being the legate to Cilicia complained that the reforms of the Pact of Union of 1198 had not been implemented. Catholicos John (Hovhannes) VI thought it necessary to appease Pope Innocent III by explaining in a letter that some of the changes had been postponed until a general synod of the Armenian Church could be summoned.<sup>60</sup> But the promised synod was never held.<sup>61</sup> The catholicoses were aware of the crisis into which a synod with such an agenda would plunge the Armenian Church. There was the possibility that the Armenian Christians in Greater Armenia could join the local anti-catholicosate movements of Aghtamar or Ani, which professed

---

<sup>58</sup> Le connétable Sémpad, "La Chronique du Royaume Petite-Arménie," *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Documents Arméniens*, vol. 1 (Paris: Imp. Nationale, 1869), p. 648.

<sup>59</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, p. 292; idem, "Die Staufer und Armenien," p. 205.

<sup>60</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, p. 132.

<sup>61</sup> It was the synod of Sis in the year 1307 which addressed the papal demands. See Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 321-23; David D. Bundy, "The Council of Sis," in *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History Offered to Professor Albert van Roey for His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Carl Laga, J.A. Munitiz, and L. van Rompay (Louvain: Peeters, 1985), pp. 42-56.

to be the true defenders of the unique Armenian religious identity.

The Armenian efforts to delay the church reform as demanded by Rome did not go unnoticed. More than twenty years after the Pact of Union had been signed, the Latin bishop of Accra, Jacob of Vitry, noted angrily that the Armenians were still clinging obstinately to their religious customs although they had sworn obedience to the pope.<sup>62</sup> While the union had no solid base in Cilicia, the Hetumid dynasty for political reasons did not discard the pact. Moreover, a severe test in Roman-Armenian relations in the thirteenth century was surmounted without dissolving the union. In 1238, Pope Gregory IX consented to the wishes of the Latin Patriarch of Antioch to subordinate the Armenian Church to the jurisdiction of Antioch.<sup>63</sup> This decision was in direct violation of the Pact of Union which made the Armenian Church subject only to the Holy See and stipulated that no other bishop of the Roman hierarchy had the right to interfere in its interior affairs. Faced with the vehement opposition of the Armenian side, the pope quickly rescinded his directive, as dissolution of the union would jeopardize his authority in Europe, where it was already being challenged by Emperor Frederick II.<sup>64</sup> In 1239, without mentioning his initial directive, the pope in a special document addressed to King Hetum I confirmed the rites and customs of the Armenian Church as long as they were in conformity with Catholic canon law. Moreover, he accepted the authenticity of the friendship pact between Saint Sylvester and Saint Gregory the Illuminator, in which the Armenian catholicos had the same rank as the patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria.<sup>65</sup> There must have been an Armenian delegation at

---

<sup>62</sup> Jacob von Vitry, "Historia Orientalis oder Hiersolymitana I," in *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. Jacques Bongars (Hanau, 1611), p. 1095: "*Licet autem Armenii summo Pontifici et sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae obedientiam promiserint, quando scilicet Rex eorum ab Imperatore Romano Henrico, terram suam recepit, et coronam regiam ab Archiepiscopo Maguntino suscepit, ritus autem tamen veteres, et consuetas observationes mutare noluerunt.*" Translation: "At that time, the Armenian King received his realm as a vassal of the Emperor Henry and was crowned by the Archbishop of Mayence; the Armenians promised obedience to the Pope and the Holy Roman Church, but they did not want to change their liturgical peculiarities and old traditions."

<sup>63</sup> Hamilton, "Armenian Church," p. 79; Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 168-69.

<sup>64</sup> Hamilton, "Armenian Church," p. 79.

<sup>65</sup> Aloysius L. Tàutu, *Acta Honorii III Papae et Gregorii IX Papae* (Romae

the papal court to present the apocryphal pact to Gregory IX, who by accepting the document's validity recognized the dignity of the Armenian catholicos as a patriarch with the same ecclesiastical honor and power as the Apostolic sees in the East. Another symbol of papal favor was the gift sent to the catholicos of the insignias of a Roman bishop—the mitre, the ring, and the stole—and, in addition and above all—a new pallium, part of the Episcopal robe,<sup>66</sup> demonstrating again that the Armenian Church

---

Vaticani: Pontificia Commissio ad Redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis. Fontes Series III, 1950), vol. 3, doc. 250, p. 333: "*rationabiles consuetudines vestras in regno Armeniae a tempore felicitis recordationis beati Silvestri papae praedecessori nostri et sancti Gregorii Catholicos eiusdem regni, qui contemporanei extitisse dicuntur, obtentas et hactenus inviolabiliter observatas, quae Sanctorum Patrum regulis minime contradicunt et canonicis non obviant institutis, vobis et per vos eidem regno auctoritate apostolica confirmamus et praesentis scripti patrocinio communimus.*" Translation: "with apostolic authority we confirm in the Armenian kingdom your traditions, rooting back to the times of our predecessor Pope Saint Silvester and the Catholicos of the Armenians, Saint Gregory, who are said to have been contemporary persons. Those traditions you received from these holy men and without changing at this time you have observed them. They are not in conflict with either the teachings of the Early Fathers or the prescripts of canon law." On the apocryphal Letter of Friendship and Concordance between St. Sylvester and Gregory the Illuminator, see Zara Pogassian, "A Revised Diplomatic Edition and a Historical and Textual Investigation of Letter of Love and Concordance between the Emperor Constantine the Great and Pope Sylvester and the King of the Armenians Trdat the Great and St. Gregory the Illuminator," Ph.D. diss. (Central European University, Budapest, 2004).

<sup>66</sup> Fontes CICO III, doc. 258, p. 335: "*Catholico Armenorum], Ut sacrosanctam Romam Ecclesiam, utpote caput omnium christifidelium et magistram, tamquam matrem filius reverenter amplectens, beato Petro et nobis, qui eidem Ecclesiae, dispositione divina, licet insufficientibus meritis, praesidemus, nostrisque successoribus canonice substituendis oboediens semper fidelis et devotus existas, quibusdam petitionibus, per nuntios tuos ex parte tua nobis exhibistis, ad gratiam exauditionis admissis, petitem a te palleum, tuo, quod olim antecessoribus tuis fuit concessum, iam prae nimia vetustate consumpto, sicut eidem nuntii exponere curaverunt, nec non mitram, stolam et anulum, in signum apostolicae dilectionis, et gratiae ac tuae devotionis indicium, fraternitati tuae per nuntios mittimus antedictos. Alias tibi, velut honorabili membro ecclesiae praenotatae, in quibus cum Domino poterimus, propitii et favorabiles affuturi. Datum Laterani, VI idus martii, anno duodecimo*" [March 10, 1239]. Loose translation omitting redundant elements of style: "We send you the pallium you asked for because yours which had been given to your predecessors a long time ago is worn out and in addition the mitre, stole, and ring as symbol of apostolic esteem. Besides we will be on your side benevolently."

The papal letter makes mention of the catholicos' ambassadors sent to the pope. These ambassadors may well have presented the pope the apocryphal Pact of

was linked directly and without intermediaries *nullo medio* to the Holy See.<sup>67</sup>

In the following decades the Armenian Church continued to cooperate with Rome. In 1243, for example, a synod convoked in Sis decided that the sick should receive extreme unction just as in the Roman Church.<sup>68</sup> The bishops and vardapets emphasized that the sacrament of extreme unction had once been in use by the Armenians and that the Catholicos Hovhannes (John) III Odznetsi (717-28) had highly recommended the practice.<sup>69</sup>

Eight years later, in 1251, the catholicos again summoned a synod in Sis, this time because of the call of Pope Innocent IV to the Eastern Churches to give their consent to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the dual procession of the Holy Spirit, the "filioque." Although the demand met fierce resistance from the Byzantines, Georgians, and Syrians, the Armenian bishops were willing to acquiesce in this theological issue.<sup>70</sup> The noted Vanakan Vardapet of Greater Armenia was appointed to write a treatise in which he demonstrated that the Roman formula was not in conflict with the Armenian dogmatic position.<sup>71</sup> The two synods clearly demonstrate that the Armenian Church accommodated the Roman Church, on condition that the papal demands harmonized with their own traditions.

It is significant, however, that Catholicos Kostandin I Bardzrberdtsi (1221-67) spurred the Armenian Church to follow the wishes of Rome in certain matters, but he was not willing to

Friendship between St. Silvester and St. Gregory the Illuminator. At that time, there was near St. Peter's basilica a church and a hospice for Armenian pilgrims attested by epigraphic documents and colophons in Armenian manuscripts. See Pavel Tchobanian, "Les colophons de manuscrits arméniens de Rome (XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle)," in Mutafian, *Roma - Armenia*, pp. 213-15. On the palliums, see Besser, "Pallium," *New Catholic Encyclopaedia*, vol. 10, p. 929.

<sup>67</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, p. 154.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 302.

<sup>69</sup> Gabriele Winkler, "Armenia and the Gradual Decline of Its Traditional Liturgical Practices as a Result of the Expanding Influence of the Holy See from the 11th to the 14th Century," in *Liturgie de l'église particulière et liturgie de l'église universelle* (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1975), pp. 329-68.

<sup>70</sup> Halfter, *Papsttum*, p. 302.

<sup>71</sup> Robert W. Thomson, "The Historical Compilation of Vardan Arewelc'i," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 43 (1989), p. 216. On the theological position of the Armenian Church toward the Filioque controversy, see Sergio La Porta, "The Filioque Controversy in Armenia," *St. Nersess Theological Review* 8 (2004): 85-116.



bend to Rome in all issues. In the years 1238 and 1247, Kostandin contacted the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, who, after the occupation of the Byzantine capital by the Fourth Crusade (1204), resided in Nicaea.<sup>72</sup> Had Rome heard about these contacts and was it suspicious of the loyalty of the Armenians? After the conquest of Constantinople it was impossible for the Armenians to be on good terms both with the Roman Church and the Greek Church.

In 1245, Pope Innocent IV sent the encyclical *Cum simus super*<sup>73</sup> to all the churches of the Orient which Rome classified as schismatic.<sup>74</sup> With many citations from the Holy Scriptures, the pontiff explained the necessity of ecclesiastical unity under the leadership of the one shepherd. What the Holy Father wanted to hear was a definitive decision in favor of the primacy of the Roman See. This encyclical was also sent to the Armenian Church, which was connected with Rome by the Pact of Union. Does this mean that Rome was in doubt about Armenian loyalty? The encyclical was carried to Sis and to the catholicos at Hromkla by the papal ambassador, Franciscan friar Dominicus of Aragon.<sup>75</sup> Catholicos Kostandin asked Vardan Vardapet to write a reply to the encyclical. In this treatise Vardan refused to acknowledge papal primacy and emphasized that not only the Roman Church but also the Armenian Church was founded by the Apostles and therefore had equal rights even if they had different founders. This reply was probably meant for the inner

<sup>72</sup> Robert Devreese, "Négociations ecclésiastiques arméno-byzantines au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Studi byzantini e neoellenici* 5 (1939): 146-51; Hratch M. Bartikian, "Les relations des Églises de l'Arménie cilicienne et de l'empire Byzantin et leurs implications politiques," in *Actes du colloque 'Les Lusignans et l'Outre Mer' (Poitiers-Lusignan 20-24 Octobre)*, ed. Claude Mutaftian (Poitiers: Université de Poitiers, 1993), pp. 47-53.

<sup>73</sup> *Bullarium Franciscanum Romanorum Pontificum*, ed. Johannis Hyacinthi Sbaralea, vol. 1 (Romae: 1759; repr. Roma: Santa Maria degli Angeli Edizione Portiuncula, 1983), pp. 362-64.

<sup>74</sup> Jean Richard, *La papauté et les missions d'Orient au Moyen Âge (13<sup>e</sup>-15<sup>e</sup> siècles)* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1998), pp. 59-61.

<sup>75</sup> Eugène Tisserant, "La légation en Orient du franciscain Dominique d'Aragon (1245-1247)," *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 24 (1924): 336-66; Odulphus van der Vat, *Die Anfänge der Franziskanermissionen im nahen Orient und in den mohammedanischen Ländern während des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Werl: Franziskusdruckerei, 1934), pp. 153-57; Leonardo Pisanu, *Innocenzo IV e i Francescani (1243-1254)* (Rome: Edizioni Francescane, 1968), pp. 135-38.

circle of the Armenian Church and may not have been presented to the papal nuncio. Kostandin, who was not as militant as Vardan, would not have risked a rupture with Rome. Like his predecessors Gregory III and Gregory IV, he gave a protestation of faith to the legate with the intent of demonstrating the orthodoxy of the Armenian Church,<sup>76</sup> but he avoided an affirmation of papal primacy.<sup>77</sup> In contrast with the professions of faith of the twelfth century, this document has been preserved in its original form.<sup>78</sup>

This situation of ambiguity changed completely when the Cilician Armenians succeeded in gaining Mongol protection for their kingdom.<sup>79</sup> Armenian theologians were then able to voice their views on the Pact of Union more freely. In 1262, Mkhitar Vardapet of Dashir (like Vardan, a close confidant of the catholicos) made a verbal attack on papal primacy in the presence of the papal legate.<sup>80</sup> It looked as if the union was really at an end.<sup>81</sup> But early in the fourteenth century, when the Mongols were in contact with the Papacy, Hetum II (a Catholic convert) tried to renew the Pact of Union with the Roman Church.<sup>82</sup>

What then is the role of the Papacy in the Cilician epoch of Armenian history? For the Cilician dynasty the close relationship with the Holy See in Rome was solely a matter of survival, so it served mainly diplomatic purposes, but only as long as

<sup>76</sup> Peter Halfter and Andrea Schmidt, "Der römische Stuhl und die armenische Christenheit zur Zeit Papst Innozenz IV.: Die Mission des Franziskaners Dominikus von Aragon nach Sis und Hromkla und das Lehrbekenntnis des Katholikos Konstantin I. Bardzrbertsi," *Le Muséon* 116 (2003): 91-135.

<sup>77</sup> In the protestation of faith, the pope is respectfully given the title of "Apostolic Father," but the entire text deals with only Christological problems.

<sup>78</sup> The document is preserved in the Archivio Segreto Vaticano. See Mutafian, *Roma - Armenia*, pp. 167-68.

<sup>79</sup> Hamilton, "Armenian Church," p. 81; David D. Bundy, "Armenian Relations with the Papacy after the Mongol Invasions," *Patristic and Byzantine Review* 5 (1986): 19-32.

<sup>80</sup> "Relation de la conférence tenue entre le Docteur Mekhitar de Daschir, envoyé du Catholicos Constantin I<sup>er</sup> et le légat du pape à Saint-Jean d'Acre en 1262," *Recueil des historiens des Croisades: Documents arméniens* (Paris: Imp. Nationale, 1869), vol. 1, pp. 689-98.

<sup>81</sup> Hamilton, "Armenian Church," p. 82.

<sup>82</sup> On the relation between the Armenian Church and the Papacy in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, see Winkler, "Armenia," pp. 353-65; Bundy, "Council of Sis," pp. 42-56; Halfter, *Papsttum*, pp. 317-30.

there was no alternative.<sup>83</sup> Their mutual relations can be seen as part of a political power game, namely to gain a strong position among the Crusader states. As the Pact of Union was based on political motivations, it did not survive the fall of the Cilician kingdom. There was therefore no true dialogue between Cilicia and Rome because there were no equal partners following a common aim. In addition, both sides had different concepts and expectations of each other, which clouded reality and prevented them from making a fair deal, even though some elements of the Roman liturgy and theological thinking were absorbed by the Armenian Church.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Hamilton, "Armenian Church," p. 86.

<sup>84</sup> On Roman influence on the Armenian liturgy, see Daniel Findikyan, "L'influence latine sur la liturgie arménienne," in Mutaſian, *Roma - Armenia*, pp. 340-44; for further details after the fall of the Cilician kingdom, see Winkler, "Armenia," pp. 365-68.

My thanks to Professor Richard G. Hovannisian who invited me to discuss the relations between the heads of the Roman Church and the Armenian religious and secular leaders of Cilicia and for his editing of this chapter. Thanks also to my wife Hanne and to Alexander Folk for assisting with the translation into English.



Levon II, Son of Hetum I, 13th Century Illumination